

Remarks

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102:

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-16, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e or a) as being anticipated by Pinchuk et al. (US 2002/0107330) ('330). The Action states that Pinchuk et al teach reversible modification of amines and S-nitroso-thiols of Pinchuk et al. as support. Applicants respectfully disagree. For an amine to be reversibly modified, reversal of the modification must restore the amine (see Applicants' specification, page 3 lines 4-7 and FIG. 1). Nitroso-thiol groups have the formula $R-S-N=O$ (or $H-S-N=O$). It is the sulfur-nitrogen bond which is labile. For this reason, nitroso-thiols are used to release nitric oxide (NO^-). Pinchuk et al. teaches attachment of the ntirosothiol to a polymer (P), yielding $P-R-S-N=O$ ($H-S-N=O$ can not be attached to an amine without first modifying the amine or the thiol ($-S-H$)). The releasing functionality of nitroso-thiol is the nitric oxide, yielding $P-R-S-H$. As taught by Pinchuk et al. the amine remains modified and is therefore not reversible modified.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (US 20010036926). Applicants respectfully disagree. Reversible modification of an amine, as claimed, requires regeneration of the amine upon reversal of the modification. The reversible disulfides linkages taught by Wolff et al. are not mechanisms of reversible modifying an amine. Cleavage of a disulfide bond leaves a thiol group and not an amine.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolff et al. (US 7,087,770) ('770). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons described above in response to the rejection over US 20010036926.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103:

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. in view of Blazyk (WO 200160162). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons described above in response to the rejection over US 20010036926.

Appl. No. **10/780,484**
Amdt. Dated **10/30/2007**
Reply to Office action of: **08/08/2007**

Double Patenting:

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17 and 19-20 have been rejected of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,087,770. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons described above in response to the rejection over US 20010036926.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-7, and 10-20 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk Ekena/
Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672
Mirus Bio Corporation
505 South Rosa Road
Madison, WI 53719
608-238-4400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
transmitted to the USPTO on this date: 8 August 2007 .

/Kirk Ekena/
Kirk Ekena